

May 2, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 4969

Instead, the United States has decided to continue to wear down the insurgents by bombing them into endless flight around the difficult terrain of South Vietnam, destroying their military installations and secret supply depots, killing or luring into defection as many as possible and thus winning time for the creation of a more viable society and government.

That is why the intensified American military action is being accompanied by strong pressure for political evolution, reform and economic stability and development, even in the midst of war.

How, then, will it end? By attrition in South Vietnam or by now unimagined accident in Moscow or Hanoi or Washington or Peking.

How soon? Probably not soon, even if the pace of combat subsides remarkably. For even if the United States is right in thinking itself to be the stronger side now, it cannot hide from the Communist forces what President Johnson knows and concedes.

Though the American military situation is considerably strengthened, he said recently, and though South Vietnam's political maturation will prove helpful, "I think we have a difficult, serious, long-drawn-out, agonizing problem that we do not yet have the answer for."

For the "other side," as it is called, the problem must appear still more difficult, serious, long-drawn-out and agonizing.

LET US GO FORWARD WITH THE
TEACHER CORPS

(Mrs. MINK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, today, as we speak, the Teacher Corps is helping the children of poverty in thousands of local school districts throughout this land to gain new and meaningful educational insights.

I am, therefore, proud and pleased to rise in strong support of the provisions for the Teacher Corps, as amended, in the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967, H.R. 7819.

Contained in part B of title I of this bill is the authorization for payment of teacher-trainee and team-leader salaries. An amendment to the compensation provisions would pay teacher trainees or "interns" \$75 a week plus \$15 a week for each dependent or the lowest salary scale of a school district, whichever is the lower of the two amounts. This lower salary payment underscores the dedication of the Teacher Corps volunteers who are willing to give 2 years of their lives in service to the children attending schools in the most deprived areas of our country. The amendment would also bring Teacher Corps compensation into conformity with the stipend rate for other Federal graduate programs. In this manner, the program would allay the fears of my colleagues who think that the young people entering the Teacher Corps are interested more in money and a degree than they are in service to the disadvantaged children of our Nation.

I do not think I need to emphasize the importance of the authority to pay the school systems for the team members' compensation. Since the purpose of the Teacher Corps is to supplement the edu-

cational staff of schools in poverty areas and to reach the educationally deprived children in those areas, it stands to reason that projects will be requested by the schools which need assistance the most but are least able to afford them.

Therefore, the Federal Government must make it possible for these schools to request and receive the assistance they need.

I believe that the Teacher Corps, which is tied to assisting schools where at least 50 percent of the children come from the lowest socioeconomic families, is one of the most effective methods of providing this assistance. One of the most vital legislative authorities of the program is the Teacher Corps team compensation provision. For those who fear the remote possibility of Federal control which might result from Federal funding, I would point out that the new amendments underscore full local control by local authorities over hiring, firing, and compensation for Teacher Corps teams.

This is a good program; it has proven its merit. It deserves continuation. For these reasons, I support the provisions for the Teacher Corps in the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967. I urge that my colleagues support these measures and assure the children now being aided of another full year of meaningful educational development.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO SUP-
PORTS H.R. 7819, THE ELEMEN-
TARY AND SECONDARY EDUCA-
TION AMENDMENTS OF 1967

(Mr. ANNUNZIO (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, Mr. QUIE has portrayed his "block grant" bill as a boon to State and local school systems, freeing them from the horrors of redtape and Federal control. Unfortunately, on close examination his bill will merely add to the problems currently experienced by our local school officials, not alleviate them.

Section 704(a)(6) of H.R. 8983, the Quie-proposed alternative to the committee-reported H.R. 7819, contains some very interesting language. It provides that any State which desires to receive a "block grant" shall submit a State plan which, among other things, "provides that any local educational agency or other applicant for assistance under this title which is denied such assistance may have an opportunity for a hearing before the State educational agency."

What "other applicants" can Mr. QUIE have in mind? Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which his proposal would replace, only local public educational agencies may apply for and receive Federal assistance.

All title I programs are planned by local educational agencies, although they must provide for educationally disadvantaged children attending nonpublic schools.

All textbooks, library books, and other instructional materials acquired under

title II are public property and are acquired under the auspices of the public schools, whether they are to be used by public or nonpublic school children and teachers.

All supplementary centers and services planned and operated under title III have as their coordinating agency the local educational agency, even though they may be initially planned by representatives of the cultural and educational resources of the community, public and private.

By allowing "other applicants" for Federal assistance, Mr. QUIE has created potential chaos. Local school systems would no longer have complete control over the education offered to their children. Any organization interested in education—a community action group, for example—could apply to the State education agency for funds to conduct its own educational program, apart from that offered by the public schools. Non-public schools—and even profitmaking schools and organizations—could seek direct grants of Federal funds from the States to operate their own educational programs, construct their own facilities, and pay their own teachers. The local school district, at the discretion of the State department of education or the Governor, could be completely bypassed.

Our present system of public education is based on the premise that the control of education in local schools is vested in locally elected school boards who are responsible to the will of the people of the school district. Our present Federal education programs are designed to reinforce this democratic system of education. Every local school board in the Nation is assured that it has exclusive control of all Federal money expended for elementary and secondary education in its school district. This is as it should be.

The proposed substitute would authorize funds for the establishment and operation of competing school systems in any school district where a group—local or otherwise—decided that the public school system did not meet the particular needs of the group. Two years ago the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) criticized title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act because he thought it would set up competing schools—now he offers an amendment which does just what he warned us against 2 years ago.

The Quie substitute could destroy the whole fabric of local control of education. We must not allow this to happen. Competing school systems must not be allowed to siphon off the funds which our local school districts need so desperately. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject this substitute and to support H.R. 7819, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967, which reflects the dedication of every Member of this House to the principle of local control of education.

BRINGING THE BLESSINGS OF THE
AUTOMOBILE AGE TO THE U.S.S.R.

(Mr. REES (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) asked and was given permission

H4970

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

May 2, 1967

to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, a major battle is now shaping up in Congress concerning the President's desire to "build bridges" to Eastern Europe in an effort to lessen the tensions of the cold war. One facet of the program is to allow the U.S. Export-Import Bank to finance the export of U.S. machine tools to Fiat of Italy, which would then be used by Fiat to develop an automobile plant in the Soviet Union for the production of some 600,000 Fiats a year.

Last December, as a member of the Foreign Trade Subcommittee of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, I went to the Soviet Union to study the Fiat transaction. The members of the subcommittee, composed of both Republicans and Democrats, were generally in favor of the transaction as it would help to move the Soviets toward a more consumer-oriented economy. The CIA reported their approval of the proposal—they are very much in favor of more consumers within the Soviet sphere. Even the Joint Chiefs of Staff liked the idea.

Unfortunately, some of our conservative Congressmen are alarmed and do not want us to participate, although the plant is to be built whether we like it or not, as the United States is not the only country in the world which produces machine tools. My observation is that my recalcitrant colleagues are not aware of the disturbing history of the automobile age. They seem to be blind to what goes on around them. They talk as if they had never financed a car, fixed a flat tire, looked at miles and miles of billboards, tried to get a motel reservation on a Labor Day weekend, breathed in lungs full of foul, smoggy air, spent hours stuck in a freeway traffic jam, or looked futilely for a parking space during the rush hour.

The average Russian has not had to experience any of these "joys" of the automobile age. As a result, he has hours, weeks, and years of leisure in which to contemplate Marx and Mao, Albania and sputnik, and the women's track team.

In Moscow, a city of 6 million souls, there are only eight gas stations and two garages. This is ridiculous; why, I must have 800 gas stations just in my congressional district of half a million souls. And freeways—they do not exist—and I do not think there is a Russian word for "parking lot," "downpayment," or "woman driver."

To understand the Fiat proposal is really to love it. The opponents of the project cannot be blamed though—they just do not have truly diabolical minds. The Joint Chiefs of Staff and the CIA do have diabolical minds—they are in favor—they hope that the project will bring the U.S.S.R. into the automobile age.

The billion-dollar investment in the plant is just the starter—the small lump of heady yeast that will swell into the biggest loaf of questionable progress the world has seen to date.

Just look at highways—they do not have many in the Soviet Union, and what

they have are not too good. This will be changed. They must have new roads or the cars will not last. A worker who has sweated and strained years to own a car will expect a road the car will ride on. If the car breaks down the first month there will be hell to pay; the worker will be so frustrated he will not make his quotas. And what about parking lots? Cars must be stored somewhere—especially in Russia or the snow will cover the car and the driver will not be able to find it until after the spring thaw.

And gas stations—there will have to be more than eight in Moscow, or nobody would ever get to work as they would spend all their time in long lines waiting for gas. There would have to be motels along the highways to stay in overnight, and once you have motels, there is no end to the problems that might arise. There will be a new surge of demand for mechanics, and as progress continues, another blessing of the advent of the automobile—the used car salesman—will appear on the scene. As you can see, the true picture of the Fiat deal begins to emerge.

Roads cannot just go along the countryside with no form of visual entertainment for the motorist—so, we have billboards. New radio stations will emerge to entertain—new modes of music since long-winded propaganda programs do little to soothe the harassed motorist. Then we will need sig-alerts to tell the motorist of the latest traffic jams, and helicopters will be pressed into service to spot the traffic jams. There will be more and more traffic jams, more "no parking" areas, and key engineers will be taken away from the moon race to figure out how to coordinate traffic signals.

Suddenly, some Russian engineer will invent the freeway—goodbye Kremlin, goodbye Gorky Park, goodbye Winter Palace—the freeway is coming through.

The smog will get thicker, trash and beer cans will start to accumulate along the vistas of the Black Sea and the Ural Mountains. The teenagers will start borrowing dad's car and there might well be a "Sunset Strip" of discotheques across the street from the Bolshoi. Down the block will be a huge courthouse to take care of cases involving traffic violations and automobile accidents. Across from that will be the emergency hospital for those unfortunates who thought their car was a troika and slammed into a snow bank. The hospital will also take care of ulcers and nervous disorders caused by the financial pressures of not being able to make the car payments or by the frustrations of prolonged traffic jams. The end will be in sight when the Japanese negotiate a license to manufacture Yamaha and Honda motorcycles in Russia.

One can imagine gangs of "Heaven's Angels" with their boots, black leather jackets and top hats emblazoned with gold dollar signs.

Yes, some if us want the Fiat plant to be built in Russia, and are ready to welcome a lot of others—Volkswagen, Cadillac, Reo, Tucker, Renault, Ford, Edsel, Packard, Studebaker, Volvo, and Jaguar. There is no reason why only the United States of America, Western Europe,

Japan, and parts of Latin America should experience the joys of the automobile age—we want to export this scourge to all—friend and foe alike. There is no reason on earth why a Russian should be able to breathe fresh air, and see his seashore, lakes and mountains unencumbered by litter, gas stations, billboards and car salvage lots. Why should not the Russians have to ruin their cities by allowing the automobile to take over? Do they not deserve the economic poverty brought on by car ownership and the neurosis that has resulted?

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING ON VIETNAM

(Mr. EDWARDS of California (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the furor which was aroused after the April 4 address at the Riverside Church in New York City by Dr. Martin Luther King is indicative of the stature and force which Dr. King carries in this country. Dr. King's words are of such power and eloquence that I respectfully urge its careful reading by Members of the Congress. We must not let the political debate of superfluous questions—such as the judiciousness of "mixing" the two central issues of our time, civil rights and peace—obscure the depth and wisdom of Dr. King's address.

For anyone who knows the total philosophical and religious view of Martin Luther King knows he could take no other action than to speak out against the role of the United States in Vietnam. In his inspirational remarks, the same quality of compassion, the same ideal of justice, and the same spirit of love which compelled Dr. King to act first in Montgomery and then throughout the South in opposition to laws of segregation and discrimination, prevails.

I have unanimous consent that the remarks of Dr. Martin Luther King, at the Riverside Church, be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point along with an excellent editorial which appeared in the New York Times of April 23, 1967. This column, written by Mr. James P. Brown, an editorial writer for the Providence Journal, concisely and clearly cites the reasoning behind Dr. King's stand and explains why clergymen all over this country are concerned about the war in Vietnam.

The speech and editorial follow:

BEYOND VIETNAM

(By Dr. Martin Luther King)

I come to this magnificent house of worship tonight because my conscience leaves me no other choice. I join you in this meeting because I am in deepest agreement with the aims and work of the organization which has brought us together: Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam. The recent statement of your executive committee are the sentiments of my own heart and I found myself in full accord when I read its opening lines: "A time comes when silence is betrayal." That time has come for us in relation to Vietnam.